



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

appeal through the greatest number of sense channels—a belief which is by no means new.

3. After all the above tests had been completed, in order to discover whether the superiority of the later-tested types of memory might be due to any extent to practise, a second auditory test was given which resulted, for the 166 juniors, in an average of 85.3 per cent.; an improvement over the first auditory test of nearly 9 per cent., but still below all other types.

4. To test the effect of repetition on memory, the last-mentioned auditory test was followed immediately by another in which the numbers were twice repeated after the first reading; this yielded an average of 92.2 per cent. A third auditory experiment was then given in which the numbers were repeated but once after the first reading; the average for this test was 90.4 per cent. The figures are self-explanatory.

WILL GRANT CHAMBERS.

COLORADO STATE NORMAL SCHOOL.

DISCUSSION

THOUGHT AND IMMEDIACY

THE point raised by Professor Bakewell in his comments on Professor Dewey's account of Immediatism¹ seems to me to be so interesting and so vital to the epistemological controversy of the day as to deserve further elucidation and discussion, even after Professor Dewey's admirable replies, with which, so far as they go, I am happy to find myself in cordial agreement.

But though Professor Dewey entirely succeeds, to my thinking, in upholding his own point of view, he does not attempt to account for the genesis of what we both consider an error, or to explain how very natural and plausible Professor Bakewell's contention is bound to appear from certain presuppositions. It seems worth while, therefore, to examine it more closely and to exhibit the underlying confusion from which it seems to arise. For so long as this confusion is allowed to persist, it is impossible to understand the plain meaning of immediatism, or to appreciate the position of Professor Dewey, against which baseless accusations of inconsistency are therefore bound to spring up.

Professor Bakewell generously disclaims, on behalf of 'the idealist' in general, what I fear can be true only of his own particular school of idealism, *viz.*, any desire to despise experience, assuring us

¹ See this JOURNAL, Vol. II., Nos. 19, 22, 25, 26.

that 'from experience he starts, to experience he ever returns,'² and infers that the issue between him and immediatism really hinges upon the interpretation of the 'treacherously ambiguous word' experience, and the character of its immediacy. So far there is no difficulty. But he goes on to betray the source of his prepossession against immediatism by indicating the ground for his intellectualist convictions. His conception of the relation of thought to perception differs profoundly from ours. Perception to him is permeated through and through with thought and dependent upon it in all its characters. The immediate experience, therefore, upon which we rest our case is and remains 'always a complex of the immediately perceived and the mediately conceived.'³ It follows, of course, that 'the facts of experience are, one and all, and from first to last, tainted with mediation,' that there is no 'sheer immediacy,'⁴ and that immediatism is an absurdity. Experience simply can not be construed without thought, and thought imports into it the whole array of 'categories' and necessitates a rationalistic account of them.

Now the whole of this attitude follows logically from its presupposition, and the latter has not been contested by Professor Dewey. He has contented himself with pointing out what is indeed a very important fact and one which rationalism habitually ignores, namely, that ultimately all reasoning processes are directly experienced and that hence there is an immediate side to all mediation, and that immediatism recognizes thought and its 'categories' as they occur and are known in experience. This Professor Bakewell admits,⁵ but it does not and can not remove his fundamental difficulty. To clear this away we must dig deeper.

We may point out, therefore, in the first place that it is *psychologically false* to treat thought as immanent in the greater part of our perceptual experience. Only such experiences are to be regarded as 'mediate' which require to be actually thought about, and are such as to set up a mediation-process (which, of course, must itself be an immediate experience, as Professor Dewey has shown). 'But if so,' I may be asked, 'do you mean to search in perception for a pure immediacy untainted by thought, for a perceptual experience which would have been what it is if no mediation had ever occurred, if no thoughts had ever entered it? Surely you can not deny that our percepts have been made by our thoughts to an unlimited extent?'

I am not, however, searching for the impossible or denying the obvious. I am pleading only for the proper psychological descrip-

² Vol. II., p. 688.

³ Vol. II., p. 688.

⁴ Vol. II., p. 690.

⁵ Vol. II., p. 690.

tion of present facts and the proper attention to tenses. To say that percepts *have been* made by thoughts is not to prove that they *now are* thoughts, and to deny their 'mediate' character is not to deny that they have been mediated. In the light of its history the rationalist's description of immediate experience is quite intelligible. Our perceptions would not have come to be what they are if thought had never entered them, and no factor in the immediate fails to disclose the effects of mediation to a careful scrutiny. But is not all this past history totally irrelevant to the present situation and to the descriptive purpose of the psychologist? Does not the appeal to it rest on a confusion between what *is mediate* and what *has been mediated*? How is the psychical immediacy of what is now experienced impaired by the reflection that much thought has gone to its making and that it can boast of a highly intellectual ancestry? Might it not conversely have been regarded as a slur upon the purity of thought that it was predestined in the course of nature to suffer transformation into an immediate experience? The rationalist's argument, in short, is one from past history to present value, from 'origin' to 'validity,' and claims perception for 'thought,' because it once *was* thought. And in view of the strenuous opposition which rationalism offers to genetic psychology, is there not a charming flavor of inconsistency about this mode of explaining away the present facts?

If then we dismiss the rationalistic description of the immediate as psychologically unwarranted, it must be admitted that there are many experiences which are immediate and purely perceptual, and that these form a sufficient basis for immediatism. If, in addition, we realize that the 'mediations' also are immediate as actually experienced, we shall wonder further where the ground for a rationalistic interpretation of experience is to come from.

At the same time it is not difficult to foresee that the rationalist, when he realizes the situation, will instinctively flee from the hard facts of psychology to the more fluid formulas of logic. He will truly urge that a logical evaluation of our immediate experience is indispensable, and that in such an evaluation its past history can not be ignored. But he will falsely add that such evaluation will necessarily restore the supremacy of the mediate over the immediate. This assertion, however, is merely a survival of intellectualistic prejudice. There is no logical necessity about reducing perception to thought on the score of its historical antecedents. All that the historical genesis logically requires us to do is to conceive them as connected. The connection itself may be viewed the other way round. It is just as logical, and just as easy, to conceive thought as culminating in perception, as aiming at a return into the immediate

form of cognition, in short, to conceive mediation as arising and persisting for the sake of enriching the immediate. Instead of saying that perception is made by thought, why not say thought is perception in the making?

In contending that this view of the logical connection was as valid as that of the rationalist, I was, however, greatly understating my case. For really its logical value and convenience are far greater than that of its traditional rival. For the true significance and value of our rational procedures surely lie in their power to enrich and improve direct perception, and to adjust and guide our actions. It is fortunate for us that our thoughts have this power to develop gradually into immediate perceptions, to abbreviate and finally to eliminate themselves and to be absorbed in higher functions which are easier and more serviceable. Their essential function is to promote and facilitate new responses adjusted to new situations, and the quicker and more unhesitating these responses can become the more valuable they are. In this respect, however, perception excels thought. It seems absurd, therefore, to regard thought as a 'higher' process than perception merely because it is more difficult and more expensive. The perceptual and immediate form is as such preferable, and it would indeed be a fool who would prefer the protracted progress of reasoning to the rapid insight of perception, in cases where either could lead to the right decision. But as a rule our perceptions are initially inadequate. They require to be mediated and developed by painful ratiocination, and hence arises the rationalistic prejudice in favor of the 'thought' process which so often displays a superior value.

This whole antithesis, however, is a mistake, a sinister survival from the philosophy of Plato. Perception is not as such 'irrational,' nor is thought ultimately separable from perception. Instead of abusing the senses, philosophers should learn to use them. They should open their eyes to the fact that in actual knowing the mediation of the immediate and the perfecting into immediacy of the mediate form one continuous process, which rises from the lowest levels of congenital perception through the labor of reflective analysis to the unerring insight of the master mind, but exhibits in all its phases one unbroken harmony, and is controlled throughout by the purpose of sustaining and enriching life. And then, perhaps, it will at last be recognized how prescient Aristotle was in discarding Plato's false antithesis, in conceiving *νοῦς*, the highest mental faculty, as immediate, in equating it with *αἰσθησις* and in connecting rather than dissevering them by the mediation of the *λόγος*.

F. C. S. SCHILLER.